

REMARKS

In the present Office Action, claims 1-58 are pending. Claims 1, 18, 36 & 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement and failing to disclose the best mode. Additionally, claims 1-58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0182447 A1 ("Schilling").

In the present response, Applicants amend all the independent claims, 1, 18, 36, and 40, to recite the limitations of identifying the invalid aspects of the invalid URL input and transforming the invalid aspects of the invalid URL. The present amendments are not meant to limit the breadth and scope of the claims, but merely to bring out explicitly matters inherent to these claims. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

The Applicants also respectfully request to schedule an interview if any of the aforementioned amendments do not result in allowance of claims 1-58. The undersigned can be reached at 206-903-2461, Monday through Friday, 8 am to 6 pm.

Rejection of Claims 1, 18, 36 & 39 Under § 112

The examiner contends that the independent claims are "not described in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention" and that "the 'intelligent rules-based analysis' is not clearly described." Applicants respectfully disagree. The following are example recitations from the specification which reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art how to make/use the claimed subject matter:

- Multilingual analysis – page 16 lines 1-15
- Spellchecking and preprocessing – page 18 lines 11-16, page 20 lines 8-15, 26 through page 21 line 3.
- Database of common URLs – page 19 line 28 through page 20 line 7, page 22 lines 19-29.
- Filtering – page 22 lines 3-9
- Searching – page 23 lines 15-21

The above illustrative examples provide sufficient detail to one skilled in the art to design, in software for example, a system for performing the above tasks. Applicants further submit that because the details of rules based analysis are thus disclosed, there is no evidence of concealment. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under the best mode clause, or submit some further basis of evidence for concealment.

Rejection of Claims 1-58 Under § 102(e)

Claims 1, 18, 36, 40 are the independent claims. Claim 1, for example, recites the following:

In a computing system, a method for providing automatic universal resource locator (URL) analysis in connection with a process implicating a URL input mechanism, comprising:

- receiving URL input from a client computing device;
- determining whether the URL input is valid;
- when the URL input is invalid, performing intelligent rules-based analysis and identifying the invalid aspects of the invalid URL input;
- transforming the invalid aspects of the invalid URL and outputting at least one valid alternative URL based upon said analysis; and
- suggesting at least one of the said alternative URLs.

(amendment underlined). The examiner contends that Schilling discloses a method for “providing runtime automatic URL analysis and suggestion” wherein the method analyzes the URL input, determines whether the URL input is valid, and if invalid, “performs intelligent rules-based analysis of the invalid URL.” In response, applicants have clarified the independent claims to highlight the differences between Schilling and the presently recited subject matter.

Schilling is directed to a resolution process for mistyped top level domains (TLDs) (see Schilling para. 10). Referring to Fig. 2 of Schilling, a root zone file is provided where a set of supplemental DNS entries correspond to a mistyped version of one of the TLDs (see para. 19). Schilling discloses a table lookup mechanism whereby a valid TLD is mapped to commonly mistyped TLDs. Accordingly, Schilling does not teach the analysis of the invalid URL to specifically identify the invalid aspects of the mistyped URL, and transforming the invalid aspects of the invalid URL to suggest one or more valid URL alternatives. Applicants respectfully submit that the table lookup mechanism for TLDs referred to in Schilling is not

an intelligent error identification and transformation method because it is well known in the art that such lookup methods are not considered in the category of “intelligent” data analysis methods.

In contrast, applicants’ claims now recite

a method for providing automatic universal resource locator (URL) analysis in connection with a process implicating a URL input mechanism, comprising:
receiving URL input from a client computing device;
determining whether the URL input is valid;
when the URL input is invalid, performing intelligent rules-based analysis and identifying the invalid aspects of the invalid URL input;
transforming the invalid aspects of the invalid URL and outputting at least one valid alternative URL based upon said analysis; and
suggesting at least one of the said alternative URLs.

“Identifying the invalid aspects of the invalid URL input” includes, for example, multilingual analysis (page 16 lines 1-15), spellchecking and preprocessing (page 18 lines 11-16, page 20 lines 8-15, 26 through page 21 line 3), utilizing a database of common URLs (page 19 line 28 through page 20 line 7, page 22 lines 19-29), and filtering (page 22 lines 3-9). The invalid aspects, once identified, are transformed and “at least one valid alternative URL” is output. The claims embrace the use of a variety of techniques which are distinct from the table lookup method of Schilling, to not only determine that a URL is invalid, but to specifically *identify* the invalid aspects of the URL, and to *transform* the invalid aspects. These techniques are in contradistinction to Schilling which does not specifically identify the invalid aspects, but merely maps the entire invalid TLD (only if previously anticipated and logged in the lookup table) to a valid TLD. Furthermore, it should be noted that Schilling is directed to the correction of TLDs. With respect to the entire URL, Schilling only discloses presenting the user with “the option of specifying the complete correct desired domain name,” rather than identifying the invalid aspects of the invalid URL and transforming the URL to output at least one valid alternative URL.

The other independent claims recite similar limitations. Claims 2-17 and 55, 19-35 and 56, 37-39 and 57, and 41-54 and 58, depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 18, 36, and 40, respectively, and thus are considered allowable for the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-58 patentably define over

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0767/186581.01
Application No.: 10/073,618
Office Action Dated: April 6, 2006


PATENT

Schilling. Withdrawal of the rejected claims and allowability of the newly introduced claims is thus earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Office Action, and submits that Claims 1-58 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: August 7, 2006


Grzegorz S. Plichta
Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439